arXiv:1704.03690v2 [math.OC] 13 Apr 2017

AUTOMATED SYNTHESIS OF INFINITE DIMENSIONAL STOCHASTIC HYBRID SYSTEMS

PUSHPAK JAGTAP AND MAJID ZAMANI

Abstract. In this paper, we provide for the first time an automated, correct-by-construction, controller synthesis scheme for a class of infinite dimensional stochastic hybrid systems, namely, hybrid stochastic retarded systems. First, we construct finite dimensional abstractions approximately bisimilar to original infinite dimensional stochastic systems having some stability property, namely, incremental input-to-state stability. Second, we construct finite abstractions approximately bisimilar to constructed finite dimensional abstractions. Both types of abstractions are derived without any state-space discretization. By using the so-called transitivity property of approximate bisimulation relations, we establish that the constructed finite abstractions are also approximately bisimilar to original infinite dimensional stochastic hybrid systems with a precision that can be chosen a-priori. Given those finite abstractions, one can synthesize controllers for infinite dimensional systems satisfying some high-level logic requirements in a systematic way. Moreover, we provide sufficient conditions for the proposed notion of incremental stability in terms of the existence of so-called incremental Lyapunov functions which reduce to some linear matrix inequalities (LMI) in the linear case. Finally, the effectiveness of the results are illustrated by synthesizing a controller regulating the temperatures in a ten-room building modeled as a hybrid stochastic delayed system.

1. Introduction

Finite (a.k.a. symbolic) abstraction techniques have gained significant attention in the last few years since they provide tools for automated, correct-by-construction, controller synthesis for several classes of control systems. In particular, such abstractions provide approximate models that are related to concrete systems by aggregating concrete states and inputs to the symbolic ones. Having such finite abstractions, one can make use of existing automata-theoretic techniques [MPS95] to synthesize hybrid controllers enforcing rich complex specifications (usually expressed as linear temporal logic formulae or as automata on infinite strings) over the original systems.

In the past few years, there have been several results providing bisimilar finite abstractions for various continuous-time non-probabilistic as well as stochastic systems. The results include construction of approximately bisimilar abstractions for incrementally stable control systems [PGT08], switched systems [GPT10], time-delayed control systems [PPDBT10, PPD15], stochastic control systems [ZMEM$^+$14], and randomly switched stochastic systems [ZA14]. However, the abstractions obtained in these results are based on state-space quantization which suffer severely from the the issue of so-called *curse of dimensionality*, i.e., the computational complexity increases exponentially with respect to the state space dimension of the concrete system.

Recently, authors in [CGG13] proposed an alternative approach for constructing approximately bisimilar abstractions for incrementally stable non-probabilistic switched systems without discretizing the state space. The concept is further extended to provide finite abstractions for incrementally stable stochastic switched systems [ZAG15], stochastic control systems [ZTA16], and infinite dimensional non-probabilistic control systems [Gir14].

In this paper, we provide a scheme for the construction of approximately bisimilar finite abstractions for a class of infinite dimensional stochastic hybrid systems, namely, hybrid stochastic retarded systems without discretizing the state space. Our main contribution is twofold. First, we introduce a notion of incremental

input-to-state stability for hybrid stochastic retarded systems and provide sufficient conditions for it in terms of the existence of a notion of so-called incremental Lyapunov functions. In the linear case, we show that the sufficient conditions reduce to a linear matrix inequality (LMI). Second, under the assumption of incremental stability property, we provide finite dimensional abstractions which are approximately bisimilar to the original infinite dimensional stochastic systems. Then, we provide approximately bisimilar finite abstractions for the constructed finite dimensional abstractions. Further, with the help of so-called transitivity property of approximate bisimulation relations, we show that the obtained finite abstractions are approximately bisimilar to the concrete infinite dimensional systems with a precision defined a-priori. Further, we demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed results by synthesizing a temperature controller enforcing a linear temporal logic specification over a ten-room building modeled as a linear hybrid stochastic delayed system.

2. Hybrid Stochastic Retarded Systems

2.1. **Notations.** Let the triplet $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ denote a probability space with a sample space Ω, filtration $\mathcal{F}$, and the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$. The filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_s)_{s\geq 0}$ satisfies the usual conditions of right continuity and completeness [Øks02]. The symbols $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^+$, and $\mathbb{R}_0^+$ denote the set of natural, nonnegative integer, integer, real, positive, and nonnegative real numbers, respectively. We use $\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ to denote a vector space of real matrices with n rows and m columns. Symbol $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the vector whose all elements are zero, except the i^{th} one, which is one. Let the family of continuous functions $\zeta : [-\tau, 0] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be denoted by $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with a norm $\|\zeta\|_{[-\tau,0]} := \sup_{-\tau\leq\theta\leq 0} \|\zeta(\theta)\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We denote by $\zeta \equiv c$ a constant function $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with value $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For $k > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, $\mathbf{L}^k_{\mathcal{F}_t}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the family of all $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$-valued random processes $\phi := \{\phi(\theta) \mid -\tau \leq \theta \leq 0\}$ such that $\sup_{-\tau\leq\theta\leq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|\phi(\theta)\|^k] < \infty$. The notation $\mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the family of all bounded $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$-valued random variables. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $\|A\|$ represents Euclidean norm of A and $\|A\|_F$ represents the Frobenius norm of A defined as $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\mathsf{Tr}(AA^T)}$, where $\mathsf{Tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a square matrix. We use $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ to denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix A, respectively. The diagonal set $\triangle \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is defined as $\triangle = \{(x, x)|x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$.
The closed ball centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with radius R is defined by $\mathcal{B}_R(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|x-y\| \leq R\}$. A set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is called a *box* if $B = \prod_{i=1}^m [c_i, d_i]$, where $c_i, d_i \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c_i < d_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. The *span* of a box B is defined as $span(B) = \min\{|d_i - c_i| \mid i = 1, \ldots, m\}$, where $|a|$ represents absolute value of $a \in \mathbb{R}$. By defining $[\mathbb{R}^m]_\eta := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid z_i = k_i\eta, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, the set $\bigcup_{b\in[\mathbb{R}^m]_\eta} \mathcal{B}_R(b)$ is a countable covering of $\mathbb{R}^m$ for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $R \geq \eta/2$. For a box $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\eta \leq span(B)$, define the η-approximation $[B]_\eta := [\mathbb{R}^m]_\eta \cap B$. Note that $[B]_\eta \neq \varnothing$ for any $\eta \leq span(B)$. We extend the notions of *span* and of approximation to finite unions of boxes as follows. Let $A = \bigcup_{j=1}^M A_j$, where each A_j is a box. Define $span(A) = \min\{span(A_j) \mid j = 1, \ldots, M\}$, and for any $\eta \leq span(A)$, define $[A]_\eta = \bigcup_{j=1}^M [A_j]_\eta$.
A continuous function $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ belongs to class $\mathcal{K}$ if it is strictly increasing and $\gamma(0) = 0$; it belongs to class $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ if $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\gamma(r) \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$. A continuous function $\beta : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ belongs to class $\mathcal{KL}$ if for each fixed s, the map $\beta(r, s)$ belongs to class $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to r and, for each fixed $r \neq 0$, the map $\beta(r, s)$ is decreasing with respect to s and $\beta(r, s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$. Given a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$, the (essential) supremum of f is denoted by $\|f\|_\infty$; we recall that $\|f\|_\infty := (\text{ess})\sup\{\|f(t)\|, t \geq 0\}$. We identify a relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq A \times B$ with the map $\mathcal{R} : A \to 2^B$ defined by $b \in \mathcal{R}(a)$ if and only if $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}$.

2.2. **Hybrid Stochastic Retarded Systems.** Let $(W_s)_{s\geq 0}$ be an $\overline{r}$-dimensional $\mathbb{F}$-Brownian motion and $(P_s)_{s\geq 0}$ be an $\tilde{r}$-dimensional $\mathbb{F}$-Poisson process. We assume that the Poisson process and the Brownian motion are independent of each other. The Poisson process $P_s := [P_s^1; \ldots; P_s^{\tilde{r}}]$ models $\tilde{r}$ kinds of events whose occurrences are assumed to be independent of each other.

Definition 2.1. *A hybrid stochastic retarded system (HSRS) is a tuple $\Sigma_R = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathsf{U}, \mathcal{U}, f, g, r)$, where:*

- $\mathbb{R}^n$ *is the state space;*
- $\mathsf{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ *is the bounded input set which is finite unions of boxes;*

- $\mathcal{U}$ *is a subset of the set of all measurable, locally essentially bounded functions of time from* $\mathbb{R}_0^+$ *to* U*;*
- $f : \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathsf{U} \to \mathbb{R}^n$*, for some* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$*, satisfies the following Lipschitz assumption: there exist constants* L_f*,* $L_u \in \mathbb{R}^+$*, such that:* $\|f(\mathsf{x}_t, u) - f(\hat{\mathsf{x}}_t, \hat{u})\| \leq L_f \|\mathsf{x}_t - \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t\|_{[-\tau,0]} + L_u \|u - \hat{u}\|$ *for all* $\mathsf{x}_t, \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ *and all* $u, \hat{u} \in \mathsf{U}$*;*
- $g : \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times \overline{r}}$ *satisfies the following Lipschitz assumption: there exists a constant* $L_g \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ *such that:* $\|g(\mathsf{x}_t) - g(\hat{\mathsf{x}}_t)\| \leq L_g \|\mathsf{x}_t - \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t\|_{[-\tau,0]}$ *for all* $\mathsf{x}_t, \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$*;*
- $r : \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times \tilde{r}}$ *satisfies the following Lipschitz assumption: there exists a constant* $L_r \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ *such that:* $\|r(\mathsf{x}_t) - r(\hat{\mathsf{x}}_t)\| \leq L_r \|\mathsf{x}_t - \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t\|_{[-\tau,0]}$ *for all* $\mathsf{x}_t, \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$*.*

An $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued continuous-time process ξ is said to be a *solution process* of Σ_R if there exists $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying

$$\mathrm{d}\,\xi(t) = f(\xi_t, \upsilon(t))\,\mathrm{d}\,t + g(\xi_t)\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t + r(\xi_t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t, \tag{2.1}$$

$\mathbb{P}$-almost surely ($\mathbb{P}$-a.s.), where f, g, and r are the drift, diffusion, and reset terms, respectively, and $\xi_t := \{\xi(t+\theta) | -\tau \leq \theta \leq 0\}$. We emphasize that postulated assumptions on f, g, and r ensure the existence and uniqueness of the solution process ξ on $t \geq -\tau$. Throughout the paper we use the notation $\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)$ to denote the value of a solution process starting from initial condition $\zeta = \{\xi(\theta) | -\tau \leq \theta \leq 0\} \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. and under the input signal υ. We also use the notation $\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}$ to denote the solution starting from initial condition $\zeta = \{\xi(\theta) | -\tau \leq \theta \leq 0\} \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. and under the input signal υ. Note that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, $\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)$ is a random variable taking values in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}$ is a random variable taking values in $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Here, we assume that the Poisson processes P^i_s, for any $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \tilde{r}\}$, have the rates of λ_i. Now we will introduce hybrid stochastic delayed systems (HSDS) as a special case of hybrid stochastic retarded systems in the following definition.

Definition 2.2. *A hybrid stochastic delayed system (HSDS) is a tuple* $\Sigma_D = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathsf{U}, \mathcal{U}, F, G, R)$*, where:*

- $\mathbb{R}^n$*,* U*, and* $\mathcal{U}$ *are the same as the ones defined in Definition 2.1;*
- $F : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathsf{U} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *satisfies the following Lipschitz assumption: there exist constants* $L_1, L_2, L_u \in \mathbb{R}^+$*, such that:* $\|F(x, y, u) - F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{u})\| \leq L_1 \|x - \hat{x}\| + L_2 \|y - \hat{y}\| + L_u \|u - \hat{u}\|$ *for all* $x, \hat{x}, y, \hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$*; and all* $u, \hat{u} \in \mathsf{U}$*;*
- $G : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times \overline{r}}$ *satisfies the following Lipschitz assumption: there exist constants* $L_3, L_4 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ *such that:* $\|G(x, z) - G(\hat{x}, \hat{z})\| \leq L_3 \|x - \hat{x}\| + L_4 \|z - \hat{z}\|$ *for all* $x, \hat{x}, z, \hat{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$*;*
- $R : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times \tilde{r}}$ *satisfies the following Lipschitz assumption: there exist constants* $L_5, L_6 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ *such that:* $\|R(x, p) - R(\hat{x}, \hat{p})\| \leq L_5 \|x - \hat{x}\| + L_6 \|p - \hat{p}\|$ *for all* $x, \hat{x}, p, \hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$*.*

An $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued continuous-time process ξ is said to be a *solution process* of Σ_D if there exists $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying

$$\mathrm{d}\,\xi(t) = F(\xi(t), \xi(t-\tau_1), \upsilon(t))\,\mathrm{d}\,t + G(\xi(t), \xi(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t + R(\xi(t), \xi(t-\tau_3))\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t, \tag{2.2}$$

$\mathbb{P}$-a.s., where F, G, and R are the drift, diffusion, and reset terms, respectively. Aforementioned assumptions on those functions ensure the existence and uniqueness of the solution process ξ on $t \geq -\tau$, where $\tau := \max\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3\}$; constants τ_1, τ_2, and τ_3 are the state delay in the drift, diffusion, and reset terms, respectively.

2.3. **Incremental Stability for HSRS and HSDS.** Here, we introduce a notion of incremental stability for HSRS (resp. HSDS).

Definition 2.3. *An HSRS* Σ_R *(resp. HSDS* Σ_D*) is incrementally input-to-state stable in the* k^{th} *moment, where* $k \geq 1$*, denoted by (*δ*-ISS-*M_k*), if there exist a* $\mathcal{KL}$ *function* β *and a* $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ *function* γ *such that for any* $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$*, any two initial conditions* $\zeta, \hat{\zeta} \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$*, and any* $\upsilon, \hat{\upsilon} \in \mathcal{U}$ *the following condition is satisfied:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t) - \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t)\|^k] \leq \beta(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}], t) + \gamma(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty). \tag{2.3}$$

One can readily verify that in the absence of delay, Definition 2.3 reduces to Definition 3.1 in [ZMEM+14]. Although the left hand side of condition (2.3) is based on Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$, one can also derive a similar property using the functional norm over $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ as showed in the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Consider a δ-ISS-M_k HSRS Σ_R (resp. HSDS Σ_D). Then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, any two initial conditions $\zeta, \hat{\zeta} \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$, and any $\upsilon, \hat{\upsilon} \in \mathcal{U}$, there exist a $\mathcal{KL}$ function $\tilde{\beta}$ and a $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ function γ such that the following inequality holds:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon} - \xi_{t,\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}] \leq \tilde{\beta}(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}], t) + \gamma(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty), \tag{2.4}$$

where $\tilde{\beta}(s,t) = \mathsf{e}^{-(t-\tau)}s + \beta(s, \max\{0, t-\tau\})$ and β and γ are the functions appearing in (2.3).

Proof. From inequality (2.3), we obtain the following inequalities:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon} - \xi_{t,\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}] \leq \beta(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}], t-\tau) + \gamma(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty), \ \forall t \geq \tau, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon} - \xi_{t,\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}] + \beta(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}], 0) + \gamma(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty), \ \forall t \in [0, \tau). \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\mathsf{e}^{-(t-\tau)}\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]} \geq \|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \tau). \tag{2.7}$$

The inequalities (2.5) and (2.6) along with (2.7) yield

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon} - \xi_{t,\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}] \leq \mathsf{e}^{-(t-\tau)}\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}] + \beta(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}], \max\{0, t-\tau\}) + \gamma(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty), \ \forall t \geq 0.$$

One can further represent this inequality as

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon} - \xi_{t,\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}] \leq \tilde{\beta}(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}], t) + \gamma(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty),$$

for all $t \geq 0$, where $\tilde{\beta}(s,t) := \mathsf{e}^{-(t-\tau)}s + \beta(s, \max\{0, t-\tau\})$ is a $\mathcal{KL}$ function. □

For later use, we provide the infinitesimal generators (denoted by operator $\mathcal{L}$) for an HSRS Σ_R and an HSDS Σ_D using Itô's differentiation [JP09, equation (23)]. Let function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ be twice differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \triangle$. The infinitesimal generator of V associated with an HSRS Σ_R in (2.1) is an operator, denoted by $\mathcal{L}V$, from $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\mathbb{R}$, and $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+, \forall \mathsf{x}_t, \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\forall u, \hat{u} \in \mathsf{U}$ it is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}V(\mathsf{x}_t, \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t) := \begin{bmatrix}\partial_x V & \partial_{\hat{x}} V\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathsf{x}_t, u) \\ f(\hat{\mathsf{x}}_t, \hat{u})\end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}\left(\begin{bmatrix} g(\mathsf{x}_t) \\ g(\hat{\mathsf{x}}_t)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} g^T(\mathsf{x}_t) & g^T(\hat{\mathsf{x}}_t)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\partial_{x,x} V & \partial_{x,\hat{x}} V \\ \partial_{\hat{x},x} V & \partial_{\hat{x},\hat{x}} V\end{bmatrix}\right) \\ + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i \big(V(\mathsf{x}_t(0) + r(\mathsf{x}_t)e_i, \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t(0) + r(\hat{\mathsf{x}}_t)e_i) - V(\mathsf{x}_t(0), \hat{\mathsf{x}}_t(0))\big).\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

The infinitesimal generator of V associated with an HSDS Σ_D in (2.2) results in an operator, denoted by $\mathcal{L}V$, from $\mathbb{R}^{8n}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ and $\forall x, \hat{x}, y, \hat{y}, z, \hat{z}, p, \hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\forall u, \hat{u} \in \mathsf{U}$ it is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}V(x, \hat{x}, y, \hat{y}, z, \hat{z}, p, \hat{p}) := \begin{bmatrix}\partial_x V & \partial_{\hat{x}} V\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} F(x, y, u) \\ F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{u})\end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}\left(\begin{bmatrix} G(x, z) \\ G(\hat{x}, \hat{z})\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} G^T(x, z) & G^T(\hat{x}, \hat{z})\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\partial_{x,x} V & \partial_{x,\hat{x}} V \\ \partial_{\hat{x},x} V & \partial_{\hat{x},\hat{x}} V\end{bmatrix}\right) \\ + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i \big(V(x + R(x,p)e_i, \hat{x} + R(\hat{x}, \hat{p})e_i) - V(x, \hat{x})\big).\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

The symbols ∂_x and $\partial_{x,\hat{x}}$ in (2.8) and (2.9) represent first and second-order partial derivatives with respect to x (1st argument) and $\hat{x}$ (2nd argument), respectively. Note that we dropped the arguments of $\partial_x V$, $\partial_{\hat{x}} V$, $\partial_{x,x} V$, $\partial_{\hat{x},x} V$, $\partial_{x,\hat{x}} V$, and $\partial_{\hat{x},\hat{x}} V$ in (2.8) and (2.9) for the sake of simplicity.
Now we describe δ-ISS-M_k in terms of existence of so-called δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov functions for HSRS and HSDS as defined next.

Definition 2.5. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R and a continuous function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ that is twice differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \triangle$. The function V is called a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function for Σ_R for $k \geq 1$, if there exist $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ functions $\underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}$, and φ, such that:*

(i) $\underline{\alpha}$(resp. $\overline{\alpha}$) is a convex (resp. concave) function;
(ii) $\forall x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\underline{\alpha}(\|x - \hat{x}\|^k) \leq V(x, \hat{x}) \leq \overline{\alpha}(\|x - \hat{x}\|^k)$;

(iii) $\forall u, \hat{u} \in \mathsf{U}$ *and* $\forall t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\phi, \hat{\phi})] \leq -\mathbb{E}[\omega(\phi(0), \hat{\phi}(0))] + \varphi(\|u - \hat{u}\|), \tag{2.10}$$

for all $\phi, \hat{\phi} \in \mathbf{L}^k_{\mathcal{F}_t}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ *satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(\theta), \hat{\phi}(\theta))] \leq \mathbb{E}[q(\phi(0), \hat{\phi}(0))], \ \forall \theta \in [-\tau, 0]; \tag{2.11}$$

where $\omega : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *is a nonnegative function such that there exists a* $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ *function* $\tilde{\omega}$ *satisfying* $\omega(x, \hat{x}) \geq \tilde{\omega}(\|x - \hat{x}\|^k)$ *and* $\lim_{\|s\| \to \infty} \frac{\tilde{\omega}(\|s\|^k)}{\overline{\alpha}(\|s\|^k)} > 0$*;* $q : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a function such that* $q(x, \hat{x}) - V(x, \hat{x}) \geq \overline{q}(\|x - \hat{x}\|)$*, where* $\overline{q}$ *is a* $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ *function satisfying* $\lim_{\|s\| \to \infty} \frac{\overline{q}(\|s\|)}{\overline{\alpha}(\|s\|^k)} > 0$.

Definition 2.6. *Consider an HSDS* Σ_D *and a continuous function* $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+_0$ *that is twice differentiable on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \triangle$*. Function* V *is called a* δ*-ISS-*M_k *Lyapunov function for* Σ_D *for* $k \geq 1$*, if there exist constants* κ_0*,* κ_1*,* κ_2*,* κ_3 *such that* $\kappa_0 \geq \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i \geq 0$*, exist a nonnegative function* $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$*,* $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ *functions* $\underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}, \varphi$*, and* $\mathcal{K}$ *function* $\hat{\omega}$ *such that: conditions (i) and (ii) in Definition 2.5 hold and* $\forall x, \hat{x}, y, \hat{y}, z, \hat{z}, p, \hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and* $\forall u, \hat{u} \in \mathsf{U}$*,*

$$\mathcal{L}V(x, \hat{x}, y, \hat{y}, z, \hat{z}, p, \hat{p}) \leq -\kappa_0 V(x, \hat{x}) - \psi(x, \hat{x}) + \kappa_1 V(y, \hat{y}) + \kappa_2 V(z, \hat{z}) + \kappa_3 V(p, \hat{p}) + \varphi(\|u - \hat{u}\|),$$

and $\psi(x, \hat{x}) \geq \hat{\omega}(\|x - \hat{x}\|^k)$ *and* $\lim_{\|s\| \to \infty} \frac{\hat{\omega}(\|s\|^k)}{\overline{\alpha}(\|s\|^k)} > 0$.

Now we provide the description of δ-ISS-M$_k$ for an HSRS Σ_R in terms of existence of δ-ISS-M$_k$ Lyapunov functions in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.7. *An HSRS* Σ_R *is* δ*-ISS-*M_k *if it admits a* δ*-ISS-*M_k *Lyapunov function as in Definition 2.5.*

Proof. The proof is inspired by the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [HM09]. Denote $\overline{\varphi} = \varphi(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty)$ and $\overline{V}_0 = \underline{\alpha}(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}])$, $\forall \upsilon, \hat{\upsilon} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\forall \zeta, \hat{\zeta} \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$. By using Lemma 3.2 and 3.3 in [HM09], there exist a constant $a_q > 0$ and a $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ function μ_ω such that $\forall t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\omega(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \geq 2\overline{\varphi}$ and $\mathbb{E}[q(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] - \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \geq a_q$, whenever $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \geq \mu_\omega^{-1}(2\overline{\varphi})$. Without loss of generality, assume $\mu_\omega^{-1}(2\overline{\varphi}) < \underline{\alpha}(\sup_{-\tau \leq \theta \leq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(\theta) - \hat{\zeta}(\theta)\|^k)] \leq \overline{V}_0$. Let J be the minimal nonnegative integer such that $M_0 = \mu_\omega^{-1}(2\overline{\varphi}) + Ja_q > \overline{V}_0$. Let $\hat{\tau} = \max\{\tau, M_0/\overline{\varphi}\}$ and $t_j = j\hat{\tau}$ for $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, J\}$. In order to prove the theorem, we need to show

$$\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq \min\{\overline{V}_0, M_j\}, \forall t \geq t_j, \tag{2.12}$$

where $M_j = \mu_\omega^{-1}(2\overline{\varphi}) + (J - j)a_q$ and $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, J\}$. First we show that $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq \overline{V}_0, \forall t \geq t_0$. Suppose that $t_a := \inf\{t > t_0 \mid \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] > \overline{V}_0\} < \infty$. Since $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))]$ is continuous in time $t \geq 0$, there exist a pair of constants t_b and t_c such that $t_0 \leq t_b \leq t_a < t_c$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] &= \overline{V_0}, \qquad t = t_b; \\ \overline{V_0} < \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] &< \overline{V_0} + a_q, \quad t_b < t \leq t_c. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

However, by generalized Itô's formula [Sko09] and condition (2.10) in Definition 2.5, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] = \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t_b), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t_b))] + \int_{t_b}^t \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon}, \xi_{s,\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}})] \, \mathrm{d}\, s \leq \overline{V_0} - \overline{\varphi}(t - t_b) \leq \overline{V_0}$$

fot all $t \in (t_b, t_c]$, which contradicts (2.13). Thus the inequality $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq \overline{V}_0$ must be true for all $t \geq t_0$. Now we show that $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq M_1, \forall t \geq t_1$. Let $t_m := \inf\{t \geq t_0 \mid \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq M_1\} < \infty$. If $t_m > t_1$, then $\forall t \in [t_0, t_1]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[q(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \geq \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] + a_q > M_1 + a_q > \overline{V}_0 \geq \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t + \theta), \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t + \theta))], \forall \theta \in [-\tau, 0]. \tag{2.14}$$

Using condition (2.10) in Definition 2.5, inequality (2.14) implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon},\xi_{t,\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}})] \leq -\overline{\varphi},\ \forall t \in [t_0,t_1].$$

Consequently, by generalized Itô's formula, we have $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq \overline{V}_0 - \overline{\varphi}\hat{\tau} < 0$, which contradicts the property of $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\ \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \geq 0,\ \forall t \geq 0$. Hence, we must have $t_m \leq t_1$. Let

$$\bar{t}_a := \inf\{t > t_m \mid \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] > M_1\} < \infty.$$

Again as $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))]$ is continuous in $t \geq 0$, there exists constants $\bar{t}_b$ and $\bar{t}_c$ such that $t_1 \leq \bar{t}_b \leq \bar{t}_a < \bar{t}_c$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] &= M_1, \qquad t = \bar{t}_b; \\ M_1 < \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] &< M_1 + a_q, \quad \bar{t}_b < t \leq \bar{t}_c. \end{aligned}$$

By using similar reasoning as before, generalized Itô's formula [Sko09] and condition (2.10) in Definition 2.5, the assumption results in contradiction, thus we have (2.12) for $j = 1$. Now define $t_j := \inf\{t \geq t_{j-1} \mid \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq M_j\} < \infty$ for $j = 2,3,\ldots,J$. By similar type of reasoning, we get $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq M_j,\ \forall t \geq t_j$. Particularly, $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq M_J = \mu_\omega^{-1}(2\overline{\varphi}), \forall t \geq t_J$. By following Jensen's inequality, one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t) - \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t)\|^k] \leq \gamma(\|\upsilon - \hat{\upsilon}\|_\infty),\ \forall t \geq t_J, \tag{2.15}$$

where $\gamma(s) = \underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mu_\omega^{-1}(2\varphi(s)))$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$. Now choose a $\mathcal{KL}$ function $\overline{\beta}$ such that $\overline{\beta}(\overline{V}_0,t) \geq 2\overline{V}_0 - \frac{\overline{V}_0}{t_J}t$, $\forall t \in [0,t_J]$. So we have $\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))] \leq \overline{\beta}(\overline{V}_0,t), \forall t \in [0,t_J]$ which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t) - \xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t)\|^k] \leq \beta(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta - \hat{\zeta}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}],t),\ \forall t \in [0,t_J], \tag{2.16}$$

where $\beta(s,t) = \underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\overline{\beta}(\underline{\alpha}(s),t))$ for any $s,t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$. From (2.15) and (2.16), one can readily verify inequality (2.3) which implies that Σ_R is δ-ISS-M$_k$. □

The next corollary propose similar results as in the previous theorem but for HSDS.

Corollary 2.8. *An HSDS Σ_D is δ-ISS-M_k if it admits a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function as in Definition 2.6.*

Proof. Let $\omega(x,\hat{x}) = \frac{1}{1+\kappa_0}\psi(x,\hat{x})$ for all $x,\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Now by considering Definition 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\phi,\hat{\phi})] =& \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0),\phi(-\tau_1),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_1),\phi(-\tau_2),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_2),\phi(-\tau_3),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_3))] \\ \leq& -\kappa_0\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))] + \kappa_1\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(-\tau_1),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_1))] + \kappa_2\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(-\tau_2),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_2))] \\ &+ \kappa_3\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(-\tau_3),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_3))] + \varphi(\|u-\hat{u}\|) \\ \leq& -\kappa_0\big(\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))] + \mathbb{E}[\omega(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))]\big) + \kappa_1\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(-\tau_1),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_1))] + \kappa_2\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(-\tau_2),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_2))] \\ &+ \kappa_3\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(-\tau_3),\hat{\phi}(-\tau_3))] - \mathbb{E}[\omega(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))] + \varphi(\|u-\hat{u}\|) \\ \leq& -(\kappa_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{3}\kappa_i)\Big(\mathbb{E}[V(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))] + \mathbb{E}[\omega(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))]\Big) - \mathbb{E}[\omega(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))] + \varphi(\|u-\hat{u}\|) \\ \leq& -\mathbb{E}[\omega(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))] + \varphi(\|u-\hat{u}\|) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $\phi,\hat{\phi} \in \mathbf{L}^k_{\mathcal{F}_t}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying condition (2.11) in Definition 2.5 with function $q(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0)) := V(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0)) + \omega(\phi(0),\hat{\phi}(0))$. Moreover, functions $\tilde{\omega}(s) = \overline{q}(s) = \frac{\tilde{\omega}(s)}{1+\kappa_0}$, $\forall s \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, satisfy properties required in condition (iii) in Definition 2.5. Therefore, V satisfies all the conditions in Definition 2.5. Thus by following Theorem 2.7, we obtain that Σ_D is δ-ISS-M$_k$. □

In the following lemma, we provide a similar result as in Corollary 2.8 but tailored to linear hybrid stochastic delayed systems in which sufficient conditions boil down to an LMI.

Lemma 2.9. *Consider an HSDS Σ_D as given in (2.2), where for all $x, y, z, p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u \in \mathsf{U}$, $F(x, y, u) := A_1x + A_2y + Bu$, for some $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $G(x, z) := [G_1x\ G_2x\ \cdots\ G_{\overline{r}}x] + [\overline{G}_1z\ \overline{G}_2z\ \cdots\ \overline{G}_{\overline{r}}z]$ and $R(x, p) := [R_1x\ R_2x\ \cdots\ R_{\tilde{r}}x] + [\overline{R}_1p\ \overline{R}_2p\ \cdots\ \overline{R}_{\tilde{r}}p]$, for some $G_i, \overline{G}_i, R_i, \overline{R}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. Then, system Σ_D is δ-ISS-M_2 if there exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying $c_1 > \sum_{i=2}^4 c_i$ and*

(2.17)
$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta & PA_2 & \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{r}} G_i^TP\overline{G}_i & \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i(P\overline{R}_i+R_i^TP\overline{R}_i) & PB \\ A_2^TP & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{r}} \overline{G}_i^TPG_i & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{r}} \overline{G}_i^TP\overline{G}_i & 0 & 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i(\overline{R}_i^TP+\overline{R}_i^TPR_i) & 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i\overline{R}_i^TP\overline{R}_i & 0 \\ B^TP & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \preceq \begin{bmatrix} -c_1P & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_2P & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_3P & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c_4P & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_5I_m \end{bmatrix}$$

where P is a symmetric positive definite matrix and $\Delta = PA_1 + A_1^TP + \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{r}} G_i^TPG_i + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i(PR_i + R_i^TP + R_i^TPR_i)$.

Proof. Consider a function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ given by

$$V(x, \hat{x}) := \frac{1}{2}(x - \hat{x})^TP(x - \hat{x}), \quad \forall x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{2.18}$$

where P is a symmetric positive definite matrix. One can readily verify that the function V in (2.18) satisfies properties (i) and (ii) in Definition 2.5 with functions $\underline{\alpha}(s) := \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\min}(P)s$ and $\overline{\alpha}(s) := \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\max}(P)s$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and $k = 2$. By considering the infinitesimal generator in (2.9) associated with the considered linear hybrid stochastic delayed system, Lipschitz assumptions, Young's inequality, consistency of norms, and (2.17) one can obtain the following chains of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}V(x, \hat{x}, y, \hat{y}, z, \hat{z}, p, \hat{p}) = (x - \hat{x})^TP(A_1(x - \hat{x}) + A_2(y - \hat{y}) + B(u - \hat{u})) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\overline{r}} \Big(G_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{G}_i(z - \hat{z})\Big)^TP\Big(G_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{G}_i(z - \hat{z})\Big) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i\Big[\Big((x - \hat{x}) + R_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{R}_i(p - \hat{p})\Big)^T \\
&\quad P\Big((x - \hat{x}) + R_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{R}_i(p - \hat{p})\Big) - (x - \hat{x})^TP(x - \hat{x})\Big] \\
&\leq (x - \hat{x})^TP(A_1(x - \hat{x}) + A_2(y - \hat{y}) + B(u - \hat{u})) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\overline{r}} \Big[(x - \hat{x})^TG_i^TPG_i(x - \hat{x}) + (x - \hat{x})^TG_i^TP\overline{G}_i(z - \hat{z}) \\
&\quad + (z - \hat{z})^T\overline{G}_i^TPG_i(x - \hat{x}) + (z - \hat{z})^T\overline{G}_i^TP\overline{G}_i(z - \hat{z})\Big] + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}} \lambda_i\Big[(x - \hat{x})^TP(R_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{R}_i(p - \hat{p})) \\
&\quad + (R_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{R}_i(p - \hat{p}))^TP(x - \hat{x}) + (R_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{R}_i(p - \hat{p}))^TP(R_i(x - \hat{x}) + \overline{R}_i(p - \hat{p}))\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq (x-\hat{x})^T P(A_1(x-\hat{x})+A_2(y-\hat{y})+B(u-\hat{u}))+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\overline{r}}\Big[(x-\hat{x})^T G_i^T P G_i(x-\hat{x})+(x-\hat{x})^T G_i^T P\overline{G}_i(z-\hat{z})\\
&\quad+(z-\hat{z})^T\overline{G}_i^T P G_i(x-\hat{x})+(z-\hat{z})^T\overline{G}_i^T P\overline{G}_i(z-\hat{z})\Big]+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\Big[(x-\hat{x})^T P(R_i(x-\hat{x})+\overline{R}_i(p-\hat{p}))\\
&\quad+((x-\hat{x})^T R_i^T+(p-\hat{p})^T\overline{R}_i^T)P(x-\hat{x})+(x-\hat{x})^T R_i^T P R_i(x-\hat{x})+(x-\hat{x})^T R_i^T P\overline{R}_i(p-\hat{p})\\
&\quad+(p-\hat{p})^T\overline{R}_i^T P R_i(x-\hat{x})+(p-\hat{p})^T\overline{R}_i^T P\overline{R}_i(p-\hat{p}))\Big]\\
&\leq\frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}x-\hat{x}\\ y-\hat{y}\\ z-\hat{z}\\ p-\hat{p}\\ u-\hat{u}\end{bmatrix}^T\begin{bmatrix}\Delta & PA_2 & \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\bar{r}}G_i^T P\overline{G}_i & \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i(P\overline{R}_i+R_i^T P\overline{R}_i) & PB\\ A_2^T P & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\bar{r}}\overline{G}_i^T P G_i & 0 & \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\bar{r}}\overline{G}_i^T P\overline{G}_i & 0 & 0\\ \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i(\overline{R}_i^T P+\overline{R}_i^T P R_i) & 0 & 0 & \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\overline{R}_i^T P\overline{R}_i & 0\\ B^T P & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}x-\hat{x}\\ y-\hat{y}\\ z-\hat{z}\\ p-\hat{p}\\ u-\hat{u}\end{bmatrix}\\
&\leq\frac{1}{2}\big(-c_1(x-\hat{x})^T P(x-\hat{x})+c_2(y-\hat{y})^T P(y-\hat{y})+c_3(z-\hat{z})^T P(z-\hat{z})+c_4(p-\hat{p})^T P(p-\hat{p})+c_5\|u-\hat{u}\|^2\big)\\
&\leq -c_1V(x,\hat{x})+c_2V(y,\hat{y})+c_3V(z,\hat{z})+c_4V(p,\hat{p})+\frac{c_5}{2}\|u-\hat{u}\|^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus by following the proof of Corollary 2.8 with $\kappa_0=\sum_{i=2}^4 c_i$, $\psi(x,\hat{x})=(c_1-\kappa_0)V(x,\hat{x})$, $\omega(x,\hat{x})=\frac{1}{1+\kappa_0}\psi(x,\hat{x})=\kappa V(x,\hat{x})$, where $\kappa=\frac{c_1-\kappa_0}{1+\kappa_0}$, $\forall t\geq 0$, $\forall\zeta,\hat{\zeta}\in\mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\forall\phi,\hat{\phi}\in\mathbf{L}^k_{\mathcal{F}_t}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying (2.11), one obtains

$$
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\phi,\hat{\phi})]\leq-\kappa\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))]+\frac{c_5}{2}\|u-\hat{u}\|^2. \tag{2.19}
$$

By using generalized Ito's formula, (2.19), condition (ii) in Definition 2.5, and Gronwall's inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))]&=\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(0),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(0))+\int_0^t\mathcal{L}V(\phi,\hat{\phi})\,\mathrm{d}\,s]=\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(0),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(0))]+\int_0^t\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\phi,\hat{\phi})]\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
&\leq\frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{2}\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(0)-\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(0)\|^2]+\int_0^t\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\phi,\hat{\phi})]\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
&\leq\frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{2}\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta-\hat{\zeta}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]}]+\int_0^t\Big(-\kappa\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(s))]+\frac{c_5}{2}\|\upsilon(s)-\hat{\upsilon}(s)\|^2\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
&\leq\frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{2}\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta-\hat{\zeta}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]}]\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}+\frac{c_5}{2\kappa}\|\upsilon-\hat{\upsilon}\|^2_\infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now by using condition (ii) in Definition 2.5, one obtains

$$
\frac{\lambda_{\min}(P)}{2}\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)-\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t)\|^2]\leq\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t))]\leq\frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{2}\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta-\hat{\zeta}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]}]\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}+\frac{c_5}{2\kappa}\|\upsilon-\hat{\upsilon}\|^2_\infty,
$$

and, hence,

$$
\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)-\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{\upsilon}}(t)\|^2]\leq\frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{\lambda_{\min}(P)}\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta-\hat{\zeta}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]}]\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}+\frac{c_5}{\lambda_{\min}(P)\kappa}\|\upsilon-\hat{\upsilon}\|^2_\infty.
$$

Therefore, by introducing functions β and γ as

$$
\beta(s,t)=\frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{\lambda_{\min}(P)}\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}s,\gamma(s)=\frac{c_5}{\lambda_{\min}(P)\kappa}s^2, \tag{2.20}
$$

for any $s,t\in\mathbb{R}^+_0$, inequality (2.3) is satisfied.

□

From now on, we raise two supplementary assumptions on δ-ISS-M$_k$ Lyapunov functions V which are used to show later results.

Assumption 2.10. *For any δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function V, one has*

$$\|V(x,y)-V(x,z)\| \leq \tilde{\gamma}(\|y-z\|), \tag{2.21}$$

$\forall x,y,z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and some concave $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ function $\tilde{\gamma}$.

Assumption 2.10 is not restrictive as long as one is only interested in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. For all $x,y,z \in \mathsf{D}$, where D is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, by applying mean value theorem to the function $y \to V(x,y)$, one obtains, $\|V(x,y)-V(x,z)\| \leq \tilde{\gamma}(\|y-z\|)$, where $\tilde{\gamma}(s) = \max_{(x,y)\in \mathsf{D}\setminus\triangle} \|\frac{\partial V(x,y)}{\partial y}\| s$.

Assumption 2.11. *For any δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function V, the function ω in Definition 2.5 satisfies $\omega(x,\hat{x}) \geq \kappa V(x,\hat{x})$ for some constant $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and any $x,\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

2.4. **Noisy and Noiseless Trajectory.** In this subsection, we provide an important technical lemma, which is used later to construct finite dimensional or finite abstractions of hybrid stochastic retarded systems. The lemma provides an upper bound on the distance between solution of Σ_R taking values randomly in $\mathcal{C}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$ and those of corresponding non-probabilistic retarded systems (denoted by $\overline{\Sigma}_R$) obtained by removing diffusion and reset terms (that is, g and r in (2.1)). From now onwards, we use notation $\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)$ to denote the value of a solution process of $\overline{\Sigma}_R$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\overline{\xi}_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}$ to denote the solution of $\overline{\Sigma}_R$ in $\mathcal{C}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$ at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ started from non-probabilistic initial condition $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\mathcal{F}_0$ is the trivial sigma-algebra, and under input signal υ. Before showing the main result of this subsection, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.12. *Consider a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function V as given in Definition 2.5 satisfying Assumption 2.11. Then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, any two initial conditions $\zeta,\hat{\zeta} \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$, and any $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\upsilon}(t))] \leq \mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}\mathbb{E}[V(\zeta(0),\hat{\zeta}(0))]. \tag{2.22}$$

Proof. Consider a δ-ISS-M$_k$ Lyapunov function V as in Definition 2.5. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and any $\zeta,\hat{\zeta} \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$, the generalized Ito's formula is given as

$$\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\upsilon}(t))] = \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(0),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\upsilon}(0)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}V(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon},\xi_{s,\hat{\zeta},\upsilon})\,\mathrm{d}\,s]. \tag{2.23}$$

By using condition (iii) in Definition 2.5, Assumption 2.11 and Gronwall's inequality, (2.23) reduces to

$$\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\upsilon}(t))] \leq \mathbb{E}[V(\zeta(0),\zeta(0))] + \int_0^t -\kappa\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s),\xi_{\hat{\zeta},\upsilon}(s))]\,\mathrm{d}\,s \leq \mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}\mathbb{E}[V(\zeta(0),\zeta(0))].$$

□

Now we provide the main result of this subsection.

Lemma 2.13. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R such that $f(o,0_m)=0_n$, $g(o)=0_{n\times\overline{r}}$, and $r(o)=0_{n\times\tilde{r}}$, where $o \equiv 0$. Suppose that $k \geq 2$ and there exists a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function V for Σ_R such that its Hessian is a positive semidefinite matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{2n\times 2n}$ and $\partial_{x,x}V(x,\hat{x}) \leq \overline{P}$, for any $x,\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and some positive semidefinite matrix $\overline{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. Then for any $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\mathcal{F}_0$ is the trivial sigma-algebra, and $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)\|^k] \leq \sigma_\zeta(g,r,t), \tag{2.24}$$

where the nonnegative valued function σ_ζ tends to zero as $t \to 0$, $t \to +\infty$, or as $L_g \to 0$ and $L_r \to 0$, where L_g and L_r are the Lipschitz constants, introduced in Definition 2.1.

Proof. In the proof, we use notation $\mathcal{H}(V)(x,\hat{x})$ to denote the Hessian matrix of V at $(x,\hat{x})\in\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. For the sake of simplicity, we drop the arguments of $\partial_{x,x}V, \partial_x V$, $\partial_{\hat{x}}V$, and $\mathcal{H}(V)$. By using Jensen's inequality and properties of V in Definition 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underline{\alpha}(\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)\|^k])\leq\mathbb{E}[\underline{\alpha}(\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)\|^k)]\leq\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t))]=\int_0^t\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}V(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon},\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})]\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
&=\int_0^t\mathbb{E}\Big[\begin{bmatrix}\partial_x V & \partial_{\hat{x}}V\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}f(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon},\upsilon(s))\\ f(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon},\upsilon(s))\end{bmatrix}+\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}(g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})g^T(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\partial_{x,x}V)\\
&\quad+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\Big(V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s)+r(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i,\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s))-V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s))\Big)\Big]\mathrm{d}\,s\\
&=\int_0^t\mathbb{E}\Big[\begin{bmatrix}\partial_x V & \partial_{\hat{x}}V\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}f(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon},\upsilon(s))\\ f(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon},\upsilon(s))\end{bmatrix}+\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}\Big(\begin{bmatrix}g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\\ g(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}g^T(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon}) & g^T(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\end{bmatrix}\mathcal{H}(V)\Big)\\
&\quad+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\Big(V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s)+r(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i,\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s)+r(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i)-V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s))\Big)\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}(g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})g^T(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\partial_{x,x}V)+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s)+r(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i,\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s))\\
&\quad-\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}\Big(\begin{bmatrix}g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\\ g(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}g^T(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon}) & g^T(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\end{bmatrix}\mathcal{H}(V)\Big)-\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s)+r(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i,\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s)+r(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i)\Big]\mathrm{d}\,s.
\end{aligned}$$

With the help of Assumptions 2.10 and 2.11, and Gronwall's inequality, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\alpha}(\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)\|^k])&\leq\int_0^t-\kappa\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s))]\,\mathrm{d}\,s+\int_0^t\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}(g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})g^T(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\partial_{x,x}V)\\
&\quad-\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}\Big(\begin{bmatrix}g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\\ g(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}g^T(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon}) & g^T(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\end{bmatrix}\mathcal{H}(V)\Big)+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\tilde{\gamma}(\|r(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i\|)]\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
&\leq\int_0^t-\kappa\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(s))]\,\mathrm{d}\,s+\int_0^t\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}(g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})g^T(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\partial_{x,x}V)+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\tilde{\gamma}(\|r(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i\|)]\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
&\leq\overline{\sigma}_\zeta(g,r,t)\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t},
\end{aligned}$$

where the function $\overline{\sigma}_\zeta$ can be computed as

$$\overline{\sigma}_\zeta(g,r,t):=\int_0^t\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{\partial_{x,x}V}g(\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})\|_F^2+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\tilde{\gamma}(\|r(\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon})e_i\|)]\,\mathrm{d}\,s.$$

Now by using Lipschitz assumptions on the diffusion and reset term one can obtain

$$\overline{\sigma}_\zeta(g,r,t)\leq\frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{\overline{P}}\|^2 n\min\{n,\overline{r}\}L_g^2\int_0^t\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{s,\zeta,\upsilon}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]}]\,\mathrm{d}\,s+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\int_0^t\tilde{\gamma}(L_r\|\overline{\xi}_{s,\zeta,\upsilon}\|_{[-\tau,0]})\,\mathrm{d}\,s.$$

Since V is a δ-ISS-M$_k$ Lyapunov function for $k\geq 2$, $f(o,0_m)=0_n$, $g(o)=0_{n\times\overline{r}}$, $r(o)=0_{n\times\tilde{r}}$, and using Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]}])^{\frac{k}{2}}&\leq\mathbb{E}[(\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]})^{\frac{k}{2}}]=\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}]\\
&\leq\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},t)+\gamma(\|\upsilon\|_\infty)\leq\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},t)+\gamma(\sup_{u\in\mathsf{U}}\{\|u\|\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}\|^2_{[-\tau,0]}]\leq(\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},t)+\gamma(\sup_{u\in\mathsf{U}}\{\|u\|\}))^{\frac{2}{k}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t,\zeta,\upsilon}\|_{[-\tau,0]}] \leq (\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},t)+\gamma(\sup_{u\in\mathsf{U}}\{\|u\|\}))^{\frac{1}{k}}.$$

By using these inequalities, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\sigma}_\zeta(g,r,t) \leq& \frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{\overline{P}}\|^2 n\min\{n,\overline{r}\}L_g^2\int_0^t(\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},s)+\gamma(\sup_{u\in\mathsf{U}}\{\|u\|\}))^{\frac{2}{k}}\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\&+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\int_0^t\tilde{\gamma}(L_r((\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},s)+\gamma(\sup_{u\in\mathsf{U}}\{\|u\|\}))^{\frac{1}{k}}))\,\mathrm{d}\,s.\end{aligned}$$

By defining

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_\zeta(g,r,t) =& \underline{\alpha}^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{\overline{P}}\|^2 n\min\{n,\overline{r}\}L_g^2\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}\int_0^t(\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},s)+\gamma(\sup_{u\in\mathsf{U}}\{\|u\|\}))^{\frac{2}{k}}\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\&+\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}}\lambda_i\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}\int_0^t\tilde{\gamma}(L_r((\tilde{\beta}(\|\zeta\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},s)+\gamma(\sup_{u\in\mathsf{U}}\{\|u\|\}))^{\frac{1}{k}}))\,\mathrm{d}\,s\Big),\end{aligned}\tag{2.25}$$

we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)\|^k]\leq\sigma_\zeta(g,r,t)$, which completes the proof. Note that $\sigma_\zeta(g,r,t)$ satisfies all the conditions proposed in the lemma. □

3. Systems and Approximate Equivalence Relations

We recall the notion of *system* introduced in [Tab09] which later serves as a unified modeling framework for the hybrid stochastic retarded systems and their finite dimensional abstractions and symbolic models.

Definition 3.1. *A systems is a tuple $S=(X,X_0,U,\longrightarrow,Y,H)$ where X is a set of states (possibly infinite), $X_0\subseteq X$ is a set of initial states, U is a set of inputs (possibly infinite), $\longrightarrow\subseteq X\times U\times X$ is a transition relation, Y is a set of outputs, and $H:X\to Y$ is an output map.*

We denote $x\xrightarrow{u}x'$ as an alternative representation for a transition $(x,u,x')\in\longrightarrow$, where state x' is called a u-successor (or simply successor) of state x, for some input $u\in U$. Moreover, a system S is said to be

- *metric*, if the output set Y is equipped with a metric $\mathbf{d}:Y\times Y\to\mathbb{R}_0^+$.
- *finite* (or *symbolic*), if X and U are finite.
- *deterministic*, if there exists at most a u-successor of x, for any $x\in X$ and $u\in U$.
- *nonblocking*, if for any $x\in X$, there exists some u-successor of x, for some $u\in U$.

For a system S, the finite state run generated from initial state $x_0\in X_0$ is a finite sequence of transitions:

$$x_0\xrightarrow{u_0}x_1\xrightarrow{u_1}\cdots\xrightarrow{u_{n-2}}x_{n-1}\xrightarrow{u_{n-1}}x_n,\tag{3.1}$$

such that $x_i\xrightarrow{u_i}x_{i+1}$, for $i\in\{0,1,\ldots,n-1\}$. The associated finite output run is given by $y_i=H(x_i)$, for $i\in\{0,1,\ldots,n-1\}$. These finite runs can be directly extended to infinite runs as well.
Now, we provide the notion of approximate (bi)simulation relation between two systems, introduced in [GP07], which is later used for analyzing and synthesizing controllers for hybrid stochastic retarded systems.

Definition 3.2. *Let $S_1=(X_1,X_{10},U_1,\underset{1}{\longrightarrow},Y_1,H_1)$ and $S_2=(X_2,X_{20},U_2,\underset{2}{\longrightarrow},Y_2,H_2)$ be two metric systems having the same output sets $Y_1=Y_2$ and metric $\mathbf{d}$. For $\varepsilon\in\mathbb{R}_0^+$, a relation $\mathcal{R}\subseteq X_1\times X_2$ is said to be an ε-approximate bisimulation relation between S_1 and S_2 if it satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) $\forall(x_1,x_2)\in\mathcal{R}$, *we have* $\mathbf{d}(H_1(x_1),H_2(x_2))\leq\varepsilon$;
(ii) $\forall(x_1,x_2)\in\mathcal{R}$, $x_1\xrightarrow[1]{u_1}x_1'$ *in* S_1 *implies* $x_2\xrightarrow[2]{u_2}x_2'$ *in* S_2 *satisfying* $(x_1',x_2')\in\mathcal{R}$;
(iii) $\forall(x_1,x_2)\in\mathcal{R}$, $x_2\xrightarrow[2]{u_2}x_2'$ *in* S_2 *implies* $x_1\xrightarrow[1]{u_1}x_1'$ *in* S_1 *satisfying* $(x_1',x_2')\in\mathcal{R}$.

If we remove condition (iii), then $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X_1 \times X_2$ is said to be an ε-approximate simulation relation from S_1 to S_2.

System S_1 is ε-approximate bisimilar to S_2, denoted by $S_1 \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_2$, if there exists an ε-approximate bisimulation relation $\mathcal{R}$ between S_1 and S_2 such that: $\forall x_{10} \in X_{10}$, $\exists x_{20} \in X_{20}$ with $(x_{10}, x_{20}) \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\forall x_{20} \in X_{20}$, $\exists x_{10} \in X_{10}$ with $(x_{10}, x_{20}) \in \mathcal{R}$. In order to present main results of the paper, we need to employ the notion of system as an abstract representation of a hybrid stochastic retarded system. First we define a metric system associated with the hybrid stochastic retarded system Σ_R, denoted by $S(\Sigma_R) = (X, X_0, U, \longrightarrow, Y, H)$, where

- X is the set of all $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$-valued random variables defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$;
- X_0 is a subset of $\mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$;
- $U = \mathcal{U}$;
- $\zeta \xrightarrow{\upsilon} \zeta'$ if ζ and ζ' are measurable in $\mathcal{F}_t$ and $\mathcal{F}_{t+h}$, respectively, for some $t \in \mathbb{R}^+_0$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and there exists a solution $\xi_t \in \mathbf{L}^k_{\mathcal{F}_t}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ of Σ_R satisfying $\xi_t = \zeta$ and $\xi_{h,\zeta,\upsilon} = \zeta'$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.;
- Y is the set of all $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued random variables defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$;
- $H(\zeta) = \zeta(0)$.

We assume that the output Y is equipped with the metric $\mathbf{d}(y, y') = \mathbb{E}[\|y - y'\|^k]^{\frac{1}{k}}$, for any $y, y' \in Y$ and some $k \geq 1$. Also note that the system $S(\Sigma_R)$ is deterministic and nonblocking. From now on, we restrict our attention to the sampled-data system, where control signals (in Σ_R) are piecewise-constant over intervals of length $h \in \mathbb{R}^+$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{U}_h = \{\upsilon \in \mathcal{U} \mid \upsilon(t) = \upsilon(ih), t \in [ih, (i+1)h), i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}.$$

The metric system associated with the sample-data hybrid stochastic retarded systems can be defined as $S_h(\Sigma_R) = (X_h, X_{h0}, U_h, \underset{h}{\longrightarrow}, Y_h, H_h)$, where $X_h = X$, $X_{h0} = X_0$, $U_h = \mathcal{U}_h$, $Y_h = Y$, $H_h = H$, and $\zeta_h \xrightarrow[h]{\upsilon_h} \zeta'_h$ if ζ_h and ζ'_h are measurable in $\mathcal{F}_{ih}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)h}$, respectively, for some $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and there exists a solution $\xi_{ih} \in \mathbf{L}^k_{\mathcal{F}_{ih}}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ of Σ_R satisfying $\xi_{ih} = \zeta_h$ and $\xi_{h,\zeta_h,\upsilon_h} = \zeta'_h$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. In other words, a finite state run of $S_h(\Sigma_R)$, represented by $\zeta_0 \xrightarrow[h]{\upsilon_0} \zeta_1 \xrightarrow[h]{\upsilon_1} \cdots \xrightarrow[h]{\upsilon_{N-1}} \zeta_N$, where $\upsilon_i \in U_h$ and $\zeta_{i+1} = \xi_{h,\zeta_i,\upsilon_i}$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$, captures solutions of HSRS Σ_R at the sampling times $t = 0, h, \ldots, Nh$, started from $\zeta_0 \in X_0$ and resulting from control input υ obtained by the concatenation of input signals $\upsilon_i \in \mathcal{U}_h$. Moreover, the corresponding finite output run $\{y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_N\}$ captures values of solutions of HSRS Σ_R at the sampling times $\{0, h, \ldots, Nh\}$ which are random variables in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

4. Finite Dimensional Abstractions for HSRS

In this section we introduce a *finite dimensional abstraction* for $S_h(\Sigma_R)$. Consider metric systems associated with the sample-data hybrid stochastic retarded systems $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and consider triple $\rho = (h, N, \zeta_s)$ of parameters, where $h \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the sampling time, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is a temporal horizon, and $\zeta_s \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a so-called source state and bounded. Let us define two metric systems as

$$S_\rho(\Sigma_R) = (X_\rho, X_{\rho 0}, U_\rho, \underset{\rho}{\longrightarrow}, Y_\rho, H_\rho),$$

$$\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R) = (X_\rho, X_{\rho 0}, U_\rho, \underset{\rho}{\longrightarrow}, Y_\rho, \overline{H}_\rho),$$

where

- $X_\rho = \mathsf{U}^N$, $X_{\rho 0} = X_\rho$, $U_\rho = \mathsf{U}$, $Y_\rho = Y_h$;
- $x_\rho \xrightarrow[\rho]{u_\rho} x'_\rho$, where $x_\rho = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N) \in X_\rho$, if and only if $x'_\rho = (u_2, \ldots, u_N, u_\rho)$;
- $H_\rho(x_\rho) = \xi_{\zeta_s, x_\rho}(Nh)$ $(\overline{H}_\rho(x_\rho) = \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s, x_\rho}(Nh))$.

Here, we abuse notation by identifying $x_\rho = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N) \in \mathsf{U}^N$ with the input curve $\upsilon : [0, Nh) \to \mathsf{U}$ such that $\upsilon(t) = u_k$ for any $t \in [(k-1)h, kh)$ for $k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ in $\xi_{\zeta_s, x_\rho}(Nh)$ and $\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s, x_\rho}(Nh)$. We use similar notations in the rest of the paper as well. Notice that system $S_\rho(\Sigma_R)$ (resp. $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$) is deterministic,

non-blocking, and *finite dimensional* (but not necessarily symbolic unless U is a finite set). Note that H_ρ and $\overline{H}_\rho$ are the output maps from non-probabilistic state $x_\rho \in X_\rho$ to an $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued random variable $\xi_{\zeta_s,x_\rho}(Nh)$ and to a non-probabilistic point $\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x_\rho}(Nh)$, respectively.

The next theorem provides one of the main results of this section on the construction of finite dimensional abstractions which are approximately bisimilar to HSRS Σ_R.

Theorem 4.1. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R, admitting a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function V of the form of the one explained in Lemma 2.13. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, let the sampling time h, temporal horizon N, and source state ζ_s be such that*

$$\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k) + \tilde{\gamma}(\sigma_{\zeta_s}(g,r,(N+1)h)^{\frac{1}{k}} + \mathcal{Z}) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathcal{Z} = \Big(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}\big(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa Nh}\sup_{u_1\in\mathsf{U}} V(\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,u_1}(h),\zeta_s(0))\big)\Big)^{\frac{1}{k}}$ and $\sigma_{\zeta_s}(\cdot)$ is given in Lemma 2.13. Then, the relation

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1 = \{(\zeta, x_\rho) \in X \times X_\rho \mid \mathbb{E}[V(H(\zeta),\overline{H}_\rho(x_\rho))] \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)\}$$

is an ε-approximate bisimulation relation between $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. Consider any $(\zeta, x_\rho) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$, where $\zeta \in X_h$ and $x_\rho = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N) \in X_\rho$. Then we have

$$(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - \overline{H}_\rho(x_\rho)\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq (\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathbb{E}[V(H(\zeta),\overline{H}_\rho(x_\rho))])^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq \varepsilon.$$

We used the convexity assumption of $\underline{\alpha}$ and the Jensen inequality to show the above inequalities. Thus, condition (i) in Definition 3.2 holds. Now we show that condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 holds. Consider any $\upsilon_h : [0,h[\to u_h$ for some $u_h \in \mathsf{U}$ and $\zeta' = \xi_{h,\zeta,\upsilon_h}$. Consider $u_\rho = u_h$ and $x'_\rho = (u_2, \ldots, u_N, u_\rho)$ and let $\overline{x}_\rho = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N, u_\rho)$ denote an input sequence in U^{N+1}. With the help of Jensen inequality, Assumption 2.10, and triangle inequality, one gets the following series of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[V(H(\zeta'),\overline{H}_\rho(x'_\rho))]\\
=&\mathbb{E}[V(H(\zeta'),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)) + V(H(\zeta'),\overline{H}_\rho(x'_\rho)) - V(H(\zeta'),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h))]\\
=&\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)) + V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x'_\rho}(Nh)) - V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h))]\\
\leq&\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)) + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\gamma}(\|\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,\zeta'_\rho}(Nh)\|)]\\
\leq&\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)) + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\gamma}(\|\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h) + \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x'_\rho}(Nh)\|)]\\
\leq&\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)) + \tilde{\gamma}(\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h)\|] + \|\overline{\xi}_{\overline{\xi}_{h,\zeta_s,u_1},x'_\rho}(Nh) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x'_\rho}(Nh)\|).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

From condition (ii) in Definition 2.5 and Lemma 2.12, we have

$$\underline{\alpha}(\|\overline{\xi}_{\overline{\xi}_{h,\zeta_s,u_1},x'_\rho}(Nh) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x'_\rho}(Nh)\|^k) \leq V(\overline{\xi}_{\overline{\xi}_{h,\zeta_s,u_1},x'_\rho}(Nh),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x'_\rho}(Nh)) \leq \mathsf{e}^{-\kappa Nh}V(\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,u_1}(h),\zeta_s(0)).$$

Hence, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\overline{\xi}_{\overline{\xi}_{h,\zeta_s,u_1},x'_\rho}(Nh) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x'_\rho}(Nh)\| &\leq \Big(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}\big(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa Nh}V(\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,u_1}(h),\zeta_s(0))\big)\Big)^{\frac{1}{k}}\\
&\leq \Big(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}\big(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa Nh}\sup_{u_1\in\mathsf{U}} V(\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,u_1}(h),\zeta_s(0))\big)\Big)^{\frac{1}{k}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Now by applying Lemma 2.12, Lemma 2.13, substituting (4.3) in (4.2), and condition (4.1) one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}[V(H(\zeta'),\overline{H}_\rho(x'_\rho))] \leq \mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k) + \tilde{\gamma}(\sigma_{\zeta_s}(g,r,(N+1)h)^{\frac{1}{k}} + \mathcal{Z}) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k).$$

Hence, $(\zeta', x'_\rho) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$. Thus condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 holds. In a similar way, one can show that condition (iii) in Definition 3.2 holds which completes the proof. □

Note that by choosing N sufficiently large in (4.1), one can enforce $\sigma_{\zeta_s}(g,r,(N+1)h)$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ to be sufficiently small. Hence, it can be readily seen that for a given precision ε and a sampling time h, there always exists large value of N such that inequality (4.1) holds. In order to mitigate the conservativeness that might result from using Lyapunov functions in the definition of relation $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$ in Theorem 4.1, the next theorem provides similar result using different relation without explicitly using Lyapunov functions.

Theorem 4.2. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R, admitting a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function of the form explained in Lemma 2.13. Given any $\varepsilon>0$, let the sampling time h, temporal horizon N, and source state ζ_s be such that*

$$(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\overline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)))^{\frac{1}{k}}+(\sigma_{\zeta_s}(g,r,(N+1)h))^{\frac{1}{k}}+(\beta(\mathcal{Z}(\zeta_s),Nh))^{\frac{1}{k}}\leq\varepsilon, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}(\zeta_s)=\sup_{u_1\in\mathsf{U}}\|\overline{\xi}_{h,\zeta_s,u_1}-\zeta_s\|^k_{[-\tau,0]}$. Then, the relation

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1=\{(\zeta,x_\rho)\in X_h\times X_\rho\mid(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta)-\overline{H}_\rho(x_\rho)\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}}\leq\varepsilon\}$$

is an ε-approximate bisimulation relation between $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. Consider any $(\zeta,x_\rho)\in\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$, where $\zeta\in X_h$ and $x_\rho=(u_1,u_2,\dots,u_N)\in X_\rho$. Then we have $(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta)-\overline{H}_\rho(x_\rho)\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}}\leq\varepsilon$. Thus condition (i) in Definition 3.2 holds. Now we show that condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 holds. Consider any $\upsilon_h:[0,h[\to u_h$ for some $u_h\in\mathsf{U}$ and $\zeta'=\xi_{h,\zeta,\upsilon_h}$. Consider $u_\rho=u_h$ and $x'_\rho=(u_2,\dots,u_N,u_\rho)$ and let $\overline{x}_\rho=(u_1,u_2,\dots,u_N,u_\rho)$ denote input sequence in U^{N+1}. With the help of Jensen inequality, Lemma 2.13, triangle inequality, and (2.3) one obtains the following chains of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta')-\overline{H}(x'_\rho)\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}}\\
&=(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta')-\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)+\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h)+\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h)-\overline{H}(x'_\rho)\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}}\\
&\leq(\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h)-\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)\|^k)^{\frac{1}{k}}+(\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,\overline{x}_\rho}((N+1)h)\|^k)^{\frac{1}{k}}\\
&\quad+(\|\overline{\xi}_{\xi_{h,\zeta_s,u_1},x'_\rho}(Nh)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x'_\rho}(Nh)\|^k)^{\frac{1}{k}}\\
&\leq(\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h)-\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)\|^k)^{\frac{1}{k}}+(\sigma_{\zeta_s}(g,r,(N+1)h))^{\frac{1}{k}}+(\beta(\sup_{u_1\in\mathsf{U}}\|\overline{\xi}_{h,\zeta_s,u_1}-\zeta_s\|^k_{[-\tau,0]},Nh))^{\frac{1}{k}}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.5}$$

From condition (ii) in Definition 2.5 and Lemma 2.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h)-\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h)\|^k&\leq\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon_h}(h),\xi_{\overline{\xi}_{Nh,\zeta_s,x_\rho},u_\rho}(h))])\leq\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\mathbb{E}[V(\zeta(0),\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x_\rho}(Nh))])\\
&\leq\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\overline{\alpha}(\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(0)-\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s,x_\rho}(Nh)\|^k]))\leq\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\overline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

Now using condition (4.4) and substituting (4.6) in (4.5) , one obtains

$$(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta')-\overline{H}(x'_\rho)\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}}\leq(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\overline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)))^{\frac{1}{k}}+(\sigma_{\zeta_s}(g,r,(N+1)h))^{\frac{1}{k}}+(\beta(\mathcal{Z}(\zeta_s),Nh))^{\frac{1}{k}}\leq\varepsilon.$$

Hence, $(\zeta',x'_\rho)\in\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$. Thus condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 holds. In a similar way, one can show that condition (iii) in Definition 3.2 holds which completes the proof. □

Note that in the above theorem, given any $\varepsilon>0$, one can select temporal horizon N to be sufficiently large to enforce terms $\sigma_{\zeta_s}(g,r,(N+1)h)$ and $\beta(\mathcal{Z}(\zeta_s),Nh)$ to be sufficiently small. This results in $(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\overline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)))^{\frac{1}{k}}<\varepsilon$ which enforces a lower bound for sampling time h. On the other hand, the results in Theorem 4.1 work independent of the choice of sampling time h as long as temporal horizon N is chosen sufficiently large.

Now we establish the results on the existence of non-probabilistic finite dimensional abstraction $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$ such that $S_h(\Sigma_R)\cong^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$ given the results in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2.

Theorem 4.3. *Consider the results in Theorem 4.1. If we select*

$$X_{h0}\subseteq\{\zeta\in\mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)\mid\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta)-\overline{H}_\rho(x_{\rho0})\|]\leq(\overline{\alpha}^{-1}\underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k))^{\frac{1}{k}},\exists x_{\rho0}\in X_{\rho0}\},$$

then we have $S_h(\Sigma_R)\cong^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. For every $\zeta \in X_{h0}$, there always exists $x_{\rho 0} \in X_{\rho 0}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - \overline{H}_\rho(x_{\rho 0})\|] \leq (\overline{\alpha}^{-1}(\underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)))^{\frac{1}{k}}$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[V(H(\zeta), \overline{H}_\rho(x_{\rho 0}))] \leq \overline{\alpha}(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - \overline{H}_\rho(x_{\rho 0})\|^k]) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k),$$

since $\overline{\alpha}$ is a $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ function. Hence, $(\zeta, x_{\rho 0}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$. In a similar way, we can show that for every $x_{\rho 0} \in X_{\rho 0}$ there exists $\zeta \in X_{h0}$ such that $(\zeta, x_{\rho 0}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$, which completes the proof. □

Theorem 4.4. *Consider the results in Theorem 4.2. If we select*

$$X_{h0} \subseteq \{\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, (\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - \overline{H}_\rho(x_{\rho 0})\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq \varepsilon, \exists x_{\rho 0} \in X_{\rho 0}\},$$

then we have $S_h(\Sigma_R) \cong^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}} \overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. For every $\zeta \in X_{h0}$, there always exists $x_{\rho 0} \in X_{\rho 0}$ such that $(\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - \overline{H}_\rho(x_{\rho 0})\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq \varepsilon$. Hence $(\zeta, x_{\rho 0}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$. In a similar way, we can show that for every $x_{\rho 0} \in X_{\rho 0}$ there exists $\zeta \in X_{h0}$ such that $(\zeta, x_{\rho 0}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$, which completes the proof. □

The next theorems provide results that are similar to those of Theorems 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4, but by using finite dimensional abstraction $S_\rho(\Sigma_R)$ rather than $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Theorem 4.5. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R, admitting a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function V. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, let the sampling time h, temporal horizon N, and source state ζ_s be such that*

$$\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k) + \tilde{\gamma}(\mathcal{Z}) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k), \tag{4.7}$$

where $\mathcal{Z} = \Big(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}\big(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa N h} \sup_{u_1 \in \mathsf{U}} \mathbb{E}[V(\xi_{\zeta_s, u_1}(h), \zeta_s(0))]\big)\Big)^{\frac{1}{k}}$. *Then, the relation*

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \{(\zeta, x_\rho) \in X_h \times X_\rho \mid \mathbb{E}[V(H(\zeta), H_\rho(x_\rho))] \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)\}$$

is an ε-approximate bisimulation relation between $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and $S_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 4.1 and is omitted due to lack of space. □

Theorem 4.6. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R, admitting a δ-ISS-M_k Lyapunov function. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, let the sampling time h, temporal horizon N, and source state ζ_s be such that*

$$(\underline{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa h}\overline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k)))^{\frac{1}{k}} + (\beta(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(\zeta_s), Nh))^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq \varepsilon, \tag{4.8}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(\zeta_s) = \sup_{u_1 \in \mathsf{U}} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{h, \zeta_s, u_1} - \zeta_s\|^k_{[-\tau, 0]}]$. *Then, the relation*

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \{(\zeta, x_\rho) \in X_h \times X_\rho \mid (\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - H_\rho(x_\rho)\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq \varepsilon\}$$

is an ε-approximate bisimulation relation between $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and $S_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 4.2 and is omitted due to lack of space. □

Theorem 4.7. *Consider the results in Theorem 4.5. If we select*

$$X_{h0} \subseteq \{\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - H_\rho(x_{\rho 0})\|] \leq (\overline{\alpha}^{-1}\underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon^k))^{\frac{1}{k}}, \exists x_{\rho 0} \in X_{\rho 0}\},$$

then we have $S_h(\Sigma_R) \cong^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}} S_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 4.3 and is omitted due to lack of space. □

Theorem 4.8. *Consider the results in Theorem 4.6. If we select*

$$X_{h0} \subseteq \{\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^b_{\mathcal{F}_0}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, (\mathbb{E}[\|H(\zeta) - H_\rho(x_{\rho 0})\|^k])^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq \varepsilon, \exists x_{\rho 0} \in X_{\rho 0}\},$$

then we have $S_h(\Sigma_R) \cong^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}} S_\rho(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 4.4 and is omitted due to lack of space. □

5. Finite Abstractions for HSRS

In this section, we provide a finite (a.k.a. symbolic) abstraction for $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ by quantizing input set U. Let us consider tuple $\overline{\rho} = (h, N, \zeta_s, \eta)$, where $\eta > 0$ is a quantization parameter and the quantized input set is denoted by $[\mathsf{U}]_\eta$ (cf. Notation in Subsection 2.1). Now, we can define corresponding finite systems as

$$S_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R) = (X_{\overline{\rho}}, X_{\overline{\rho}0}, U_{\overline{\rho}}, \underset{\overline{\rho}}{\longrightarrow}, Y_{\overline{\rho}}, H_{\overline{\rho}}),$$

$$\overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R) = (X_{\overline{\rho}}, X_{\overline{\rho}0}, U_{\overline{\rho}}, \underset{\overline{\rho}}{\longrightarrow}, Y_{\overline{\rho}}, \overline{H}_{\overline{\rho}}),$$

where

- $X_{\overline{\rho}} = [\mathsf{U}]_\eta^N$,$X_{\overline{\rho}0} = X_{\overline{\rho}}$, $U_{\overline{\rho}} = [\mathsf{U}]_\eta$, $Y_{\overline{\rho}} = Y_h$;
- $x_{\overline{\rho}} \xrightarrow[\overline{\rho}]{\overline{u}_{\overline{\rho}}} x'_{\overline{\rho}}$, where $x_{\overline{\rho}} = (\overline{u}_1, \overline{u}_2, \ldots, \overline{u}_N) \in X_{\overline{\rho}}$, if and only if $x'_{\overline{\rho}} = (\overline{u}_2, \ldots, \overline{u}_N, \overline{u}_{\overline{\rho}})$;
- $H_{\overline{\rho}}(x_{\overline{\rho}}) = \xi_{\zeta_s, x_{\overline{\rho}}}(Nh)$ $(\overline{H}_{\overline{\rho}}(x_{\overline{\rho}}) = \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s, x_{\overline{\rho}}}(Nh))$.

In order to provide approximate bisimulation relation between sampled hybrid stochastic retarded system and symbolic models, we need following technical lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Consider a δ-ISS-M_k HSRS Σ_R and a quantization parameter η such that $0 < \eta \leq span(\mathsf{U})$. Then the relation $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$ given by*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_2 = \{(x_\rho, x_{\overline{\rho}}) \in X_\rho \times X_{\overline{\rho}} \mid x_\rho = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N), x_{\overline{\rho}} = ([u_1]_\eta, [u_2]_\eta, \ldots, [u_N]_\eta)\} \tag{5.1}$$

is a $(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}$-approximate bisimulation relation between $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$ and $\overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$, and $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R) \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}} \overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$.

Proof. Let $(x_\rho, x_{\overline{\rho}}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$, then $\|u_i - [u_i]_\eta\| \leq \eta$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ implies that $\|x_\rho - x_{\overline{\rho}}\|_\infty \leq \eta$. By using the definition of δ-ISS-M_k, one obtains

$$(\|\overline{H}_\rho(x_\rho) - \overline{H}_{\overline{\rho}}(x_{\overline{\rho}})\|^k)^{\frac{1}{k}} = (\|\overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s, x_\rho}(Nh) - \overline{\xi}_{\zeta_s, x_{\overline{\rho}}}(Nh)\|^k)^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq (\gamma(\|x_\rho - x_{\overline{\rho}}\|_\infty))^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq (\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}.$$

Then, the first condition in Definition 3.2 holds. Now, consider any $(x_\rho, x_{\overline{\rho}}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$, where $x_\rho = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N)$ and $x_{\overline{\rho}} = (\overline{u}_1, \overline{u}_2, \ldots, \overline{u}_N)$. Let $u \in U_\rho$ and consider $x_\rho \xrightarrow[\rho]{u} x'_\rho := (u_2, \ldots, u_N, u)$ in $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$. Choose $\overline{u} = [u]_\eta$ and consider $x_{\overline{\rho}} \xrightarrow[\overline{\rho}]{\overline{u}} x'_{\overline{\rho}} := (\overline{u}_2, \ldots, \overline{u}_N, \overline{u})$ in $\overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$. It is obvious that $(x'_\rho, x'_{\overline{\rho}}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$ and, hence, condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 holds. Similarly, condition (iii) in Definition 3.2 holds which shows $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$ is a $(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}$-approximate bisimulation relation between $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R)$ and $\overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$. For any $x_{\rho 0} := (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N) \in X_{\rho 0}$, there always exists $x_{\overline{\rho}0} := ([u_1]_\eta, [u_2]_\eta, \ldots, [u_N]_\eta) \in X_{\overline{\rho}0}$ and, hence, $(x_{\rho 0}, x_{\overline{\rho}0}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$. Note that the existence of such $x_{\rho 0}$ is guaranteed by U being a finite union of boxes and by the inequality $\eta \leq span(\mathsf{U})$. Moreover, for any $x_{\overline{\rho}0} \in X_{\overline{\rho}0}$ and by choosing $x_{\rho 0} = x_{\overline{\rho}0}$, one readily gets $(x_{\rho 0}, x_{\overline{\rho}0}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$ and, hence, $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_R) \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}} \overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$. □

The next lemma provides results that are similar to those of Lemma 5.1 but by using symbolic model $S_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Consider a δ-ISS-M_k HSRS Σ_R and a quantization parameter $0 < \eta \leq span(\mathsf{U})$. Then the relation $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$ as given in Lemma 5.1 is a $(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}$-approximate bisimulation relation between $S_\rho(\Sigma_R)$ and $S_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$, and $S_\rho(\Sigma_R) \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}} S_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 5.1 and is omitted due to lack of space. □

Now we provide the main results of this section on establishing an approximate bisimulation relation between $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and $\overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$, which is an immediate consequence of the so-called transitivity property of approximate bisimulation relations [GP07, Proposition 4] as recalled next.

Proposition 5.3. *Consider metric systems S_1, S_2, and S_3 having $S_1 \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{\delta} S_2$ and $S_2 \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{\hat{\delta}} S_3$, for some $\delta, \hat{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$. Then we have $S_1 \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{\delta+\hat{\delta}} S_3$.*

Theorem 5.4. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the results in Theorem 4.1 (or 4.2), and a quantization parameter $0 < \eta \leq span(\mathsf{U})$. Then, the relation $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ given by*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}} = \{(x_h, x_{\overline{\rho}}) \in X_h \times X_{\overline{\rho}} | \exists x_\rho \in X_\rho, (x_h, x_\rho) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_1 \text{ and } (x_\rho, x_{\overline{\rho}}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_2\}$$

is a $(\varepsilon + (\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}})$-approximate bisimulation relation between $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and $\overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$.

Note that relations $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_2$ in Theorem 5.4 have been defined in Theorem 4.1 (or 4.2), and Lemma 5.1, respectively.

Theorem 5.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.4, let us choose X_{h0} as in Theorem 4.3 (or 4.4). Then, we have $S_h(\Sigma_R) \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{\varepsilon+(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}} \overline{S}_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$.*

The proof is a simple consequence of the results in Theorem 4.7 (or 4.8), Lemma 5.1, and Proposition 5.3. Note that by referring to the discussion after Theorem 4.1 (or 4.2), one can achieve any abstraction precision in Theorem 5.5 by choosing sufficiently large temporal horizon N and sufficiently small input set quantization η.

In a similar way, with the help of so-called transitivity property of bisimulation relations as in Proposition 5.3, we can provide an approximate bisimulation relation between sampled hybrid stochastic retarded system $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and the symbolic model $S_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$ with probabilistic output values as the following.

Theorem 5.6. *Consider an HSRS Σ_R. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the results in Theorem 4.5 (or 4.6), and quantization parameter $0 < \eta \leq span(\mathsf{U})$. Then, the relation $\mathcal{R}$ given by*

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(x_h, x_{\overline{\rho}}) \in X_h \times X_{\overline{\rho}} | \exists x_\rho \in X_\rho, (x_h, x_\rho) \in \mathcal{R}_1 \text{ and } (x_\rho, x_{\overline{\rho}}) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_2\}$$

is a $(\varepsilon + (\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}})$-approximate bisimulation relation between $S_h(\Sigma_R)$ and $S_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$.

Theorem 5.7. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.6, let us choose X_{h0} as in Theorem 4.7 (or 4.8). Then we have $S_h(\Sigma_R) \cong_{\mathcal{S}}^{\varepsilon+(\gamma(\eta))^{\frac{1}{k}}} S_{\overline{\rho}}(\Sigma_R)$.*

6. An Example

To show the effectiveness of the proposed results, we consider a simple thermal model of ten-room building as shown schematically in Figure 1. Here, we consider that the dynamic is affected by delays in states and by noise and jumps (modeling door and window opening). The dynamic of the considered hybrid stochastic delayed system Σ_D is given by the following delayed stochastic differential equations:



FIGURE 1. A schematic of ten-room building.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_1(t) =&(\alpha_{21}(\xi_2(t)-\xi_1(t))+\alpha_{e_1}(T_e-\xi_1(t))-\alpha_{1\tau_1}\xi_1(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_1\xi_1(t)+g_{1\tau_2}\xi_1(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^1+r_1\xi_1(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^1,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_2(t) =&(\alpha_{12}(\xi_1(t)-\xi_2(t))+\alpha_{72}(\xi_7(t)-\xi_2(t))+\alpha_{92}(\xi_9(t)-\xi_2(t))+\alpha_{32}(\xi_3(t)-\xi_2(t))+\alpha_{e_2}(T_e-\xi_2(t))\\
&-\alpha_{2\tau_1}\xi_2(t-\tau_1)+\alpha_{H_1}(T_h-\xi_2(t))\upsilon_1)\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_2\xi_2(t)+g_{2\tau_2}\xi_2(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^2+r_1\xi_2(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^2,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_3(t) =&(\alpha_{23}(\xi_2(t)-\xi_3(t))+\alpha_{43}(\xi_4(t)-\xi_3(t))+\alpha_{e_3}(T_e-\xi_3(t))-\alpha_{3\tau_1}\xi_3(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t\\
&+(g_3\xi_3(t)+g_{3\tau_2}\xi_3(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^3+r_3\xi_3(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^3,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_4(t) =&(\alpha_{34}(\xi_3(t)-\xi_4(t))+\alpha_{54}(\xi_5(t)-\xi_4(t))+\alpha_{e_4}(T_e-\xi_4(t))-\alpha_{4\tau_1}\xi_4(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t\\
&+(g_4\xi_4(t)+g_{4\tau_2}\xi_4(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^4+r_4\xi_4(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^4,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_5(t) =&(\alpha_{45}(\xi_4(t)-\xi_5(t))+\alpha_{85}(\xi_8(t)-\xi_5(t))+\alpha_{105}(\xi_{10}(t)-\xi_5(t))+\alpha_{65}(\xi_6(t)-\xi_5(t))+\alpha_{e_5}(T_e-\xi_5(t))\\
&-\alpha_{5\tau_1}\xi_5(t-\tau_1)+\alpha_{H_2}(T_h-\xi_5(t))\upsilon_2)\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_5\xi_5(t)+g_{5\tau_2}\xi_5(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^5+r_5\xi_5(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^5,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_6(t) =&(\alpha_{56}(\xi_5(t)-\xi_6(t))+\alpha_{e_6}(T_e-\xi_6(t))-\alpha_{6\tau_1}\xi_6(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_6\xi_6(t)+g_{6\tau_2}\xi_6(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^6+r_6\xi_6(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^6,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_7(t) =&(\alpha_{27}(\xi_2(t)-\xi_7(t))+\alpha_{e_7}(T_e-\xi_7(t))-\alpha_{7\tau_1}\xi_7(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_7\xi_7(t)+g_{7\tau_2}\xi_7(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^7+r_7\xi_7(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^7,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_8(t) =&(\alpha_{58}(\xi_5(t)-\xi_8(t))+\alpha_{e_8}(T_e-\xi_8(t))-\alpha_{8\tau_1}\xi_8(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_8\xi_8(t)+g_{8\tau_2}\xi_8(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^8+r_8\xi_8(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^8,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_9(t) =&(\alpha_{29}(\xi_2(t)-\xi_9(t))+\alpha_{e_9}(T_e-\xi_9(t))-\alpha_{9\tau_1}\xi_9(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_9\xi_9(t)+g_{9\tau_2}\xi_9(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^9+r_9\xi_9(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^9,\\
\mathrm{d}\,\xi_{10}(t) =&(\alpha_{510}(\xi_5(t)-\xi_{10}(t))+\alpha_{e_{10}}(T_e-\xi_{10}(t))-\alpha_{10\tau_1}\xi_{10}(t-\tau_1))\,\mathrm{d}\,t+(g_{10}\xi_{10}(t)+g_{10\tau_2}\xi_{10}(t-\tau_2))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t^{10}\\
&+r_{10}\xi_{10}(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,P_t^{10},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the terms W_t^i and P_t^i, $i\in\{1,2,\dots,10\}$, denote the standard Brownian motion and Poisson process with rate $\lambda_i=0.1$, respectively; ξ_i, $i\in\{1,2,\dots,10\}$, denote the temperature in each room; $T_e=15$ (degree Celsius) is the external temperature; $T_{H_1}=T_{H_2}=100$ are the temperatures of two heaters; $\tau_1=15$ time units and $\tau_2=10$ time units are state delays in drift and diffusion terms, respectively; and the control inputs υ_1, υ_2 are amounted to 1 if corresponding heaters are on and to 0 if corresponding heaters are off. Here, we assume that at most one heater is on at each time instance which results in the finite input set $\mathsf{U}=\{(1,0),(0,1),(0,0)\}$. The system parameters are chosen as $\alpha_{ij}=5\times10^{-2}$ for all $i\neq j$ and $i,j\in\{1,2,\dots,10\}$, $\alpha_{e2}=\alpha_{e5}=8\times10^{-3}$, $\alpha_{e1}=\alpha_{e3}=\alpha_{e4}=\alpha_{e6}=\alpha_{e7}=\alpha_{e8}=\alpha_{e9}=\alpha_{e10}=5\times10^{-3}$, $\alpha_{H_1}=\alpha_{H_2}=3.6\times10^{-3}$, $\alpha_{i\tau_1}=1\times10^{-4}$, $g_i=2\times10^{-3}$, $g_{i\tau_2}=1\times10^{-4}$, and $r_i=1\times10^{-3}$, for $i\in\{1,2,\dots,10\}$. Using the result in Lemma 2.9 with $P=I_{10}$, one can readily compute function $\beta(s,t)=\mathsf{e}^{-\kappa t}s$, $\forall s\in\mathbb{R}_0^+$, with $\kappa=0.0129$.

By considering the 2nd moment, i.e. $k=2$, a constant function $\zeta_s\equiv[17,17,17,17,17,17,17,17,17,17]^T\in\mathcal{C}([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$, a precision $\varepsilon=0.35$ and by fixing sampling time $h=30$ time units, one can obtain temporal horizon $N=14$ for $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_D)$, satisfying inequality (4.4) in Theorem 4.2. Therefore, the resulting cardinality of the set of states of $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_D)$ is $3^{14}=4782969$. Note that using the results in Theorem 4.1 one obtains $N=18$ which results in a bigger abstraction. Remark that since the input set is finite, the finite dimensional abstraction $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_D)$ is also symbolic.

Now consider the objective to design a controller enforcing the trajectories of Σ_D to stay within $\mathsf{W}=[18,21]^{10}$. This corresponds to the LTL specification $\Box\mathsf{W}$. The computation of the symbolic model $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_D)$ and the controller synthesis have been performed using tool `QUEST` [que17] on a computer with CPU 3.5GHz Intel Core



FIGURE 2. A few realizations of the solution process $\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}$ with initial condition $\zeta \equiv [19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19]^T$.



FIGURE 3. The evolution of input signals υ_1 and υ_2.

i7. Figure 2 shows a few realizations of the closed-loop solution process $\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}$ starting form initial condition $\zeta \equiv [19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19]^T \in X_{h0}$. The synthesized control signals υ_1 and υ_2 are shown in Figure 3. In Figure 4, we show the square root of the average value (over 10000 realizations) of the squared distance in time of the solution process $\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}$ to the set W, namely $\|\xi_{\zeta,\upsilon}(t)\|^2_{\mathsf{W}}$, where the point to set distance is defined

as $\|x\|^2_{\mathsf{W}} = \inf_{w\in\mathsf{W}} \|x-w\|^2$. One can readily observe that the empirical average is much lower than the precision $\varepsilon = 0.35$. In Table 1, we report sizes of finite abstractions (given by number of transitions), sizes of controllers, lower bounds for precision ε, and computation time required for constructing finite abstractions and controllers for different values of N.



FIGURE 4. The square root of average values (over 10000 realizations) of the squared distance of the solution process $\xi_{\zeta,v}$ to the set W.

TABLE 1. Performance comparison for different values of temporal horizon N.

N	15	14	13	11	9
Number of transitions in $\overline{S}_\rho(\Sigma_D)$	43046721	14348907	4782969	531441	59049
Number of transitions in the controller	695971	222862	70757	6819	982
Abstraction computation time (Sec)	93.37	24.204	6.84	0.413	0.015
Controller computation time (Sec)	3650.57	1150.98	354.59	2.56	2.07
precision ε	0.28	0.35	0.42	0.63	0.94

REFERENCES

[CGG13] E. Le Corronc, A. Girard, and G. Goessler. Mode sequences as symbolic states in abstractions of incrementally stable switched systems. In *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 3225–3230, Dec 2013.

[Gir14] A. Girard. Approximately bisimilar abstractions of incrementally stable finite or infinite dimensional systems. In *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 824–829, Dec 2014.

[GP07] A. Girard and G. J. Pappas. Approximation metrics for discrete and continuous systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 52(5):782–798, May 2007.

[GPT10] A. Girard, G. Pola, and P. Tabuada. Approximately bisimilar symbolic models for incrementally stable switched systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(1):116–126, January 2010.

[HM09] L. Huang and X. Mao. On input-to-state stability of stochastic retarded systems with Markovian switching. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(8):1898–1902, August 2009.

[JP09] A. A. Julius and G. J. Pappas. Approximations of stochastic hybrid systems. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, 54(6):1193–1203, June 2009.

[MPS95] O. Maler, A. Pnueli, and J. Sifakis. On the synthesis of discrete controllers for timed systems. In *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 229–242. Springer, 1995.

[Øks02] B. Øksendal. *Stochastic differential equations: An introduction with applications*. Springer, 5th edition, November 2002.

[PGT08] G. Pola, A. Girard, and P. Tabuada. Approximately bisimilar symbolic models for nonlinear control systems. *Automatica*, 44(10):2508–2516, October 2008.

[PPD15] G. Pola, P. Pepe, and M. D. Di Benedetto. Symbolic models for timevarying timedelay systems via alternating approximate bisimulation. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 25(14):1099–1239, 2015.

[PPDBT10] G. Pola, P. Pepe, M. D. Di Benedetto, and P. Tabuada. Symbolic models for nonlinear time-delay systems using approximate bisimulations. *Systems & Control Letters*, 59(6):365–373, 2010.

[que17] QUEST: A tool for state-space quantization-free synthesis of symbolic controllers, March 2017. `https://www.hcs.ei.tum.de/en/software/quest/`.

[Sko09] A. Skorokhod. *Asymptotic methods in the theory of stochastic differential equations*. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.

[Tab09] P. Tabuada. *Verification and control of hybrid systems: a symbolic approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

[ZA14] M. Zamani and A. Abate. Approximately bisimilar symbolic models for randomly switched stochastic systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 69:38–46, July 2014.

[ZAG15] M. Zamani, A. Abate, and A. Girard. Symbolic models for stochastic switched systems: A discretization and a discretization-free approach. *Automatica*, 55:183–196, May 2015.

[ZMEM+14] M. Zamani, P. M. Esfahani, R. Majumdar, A. Abate, and J. Lygeros. Symbolic control of stochastic systems via approximately bisimilar finite abstractions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(12):3135–3150, December 2014.

[ZTA16] M. Zamani, I. Tkachev, and A. Abate. Towards scalable synthesis of stochastic control systems. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, pages 1–29, 2016.

[1]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Technical University of Munich, D-80290 Munich, Germany.

E-mail address: {pushpak.jagtap,zamani}@tum.de

URL: http://www.hcs.ei.tum.de